

09/446,320

# REMARKS

## The Rejections of the Claims

The Examiner has rejected claims 5, 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by DE 19,513,318 (Jantzen) using an English translation prepared at the request of the USPTO. The Examiner says that Jantzen teaches all that is called for in independent claim 12. More specifically the Examiner says that the system of Jantzen comprises a redundancy means, box 36 of Fig. 1, an evaluation stage referring to the last line of page 8 to the last three lines of page 9 and an output stage stating that box 36 output stage is for data coming to lines 11 and 12 from line 46 for all of the bus lines.

As is taught and claimed by applicant in claim 12, the redundancy means of the present invention comprises "an input stage at least for each of said bus lines, an evaluation stage and an output stage for all the bus lines." These same words are also in independent claim 13. Thus as is taught and claimed by applicant the evaluation stage is part of the redundancy means.

Jantzen describes boxes 33 to 36 of Fig. 1 as multiplexers "which are suitable for the bidirectional transfer of data ... between a serial bus interface 43 thru 46 and one of the parallel lines 11 thru 1n." (see page 6, line 18-21). As the Examiner correctly points out Jantzen at the last line of page 8 to the first three lines of page 9 teaches that monitoring "is carried out on the active bus and the primary bus for the completeness and accuracy of the data" (page 9, lines 1-3) but Jantzen does not state or even suggest that the monitoring is carried out by the multiplexers. In fact, Jantzen does not teach, disclose or even suggest where the monitoring is performed other than that the monitoring is carried out on at least the active bus and the primary bus. It is only the applicant that teaches that the evaluation stage is part of the redundancy means.

Further applicant submits that Jantzen would not lead or

09/446,320

even suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the evaluation stage in the multiplexers 33 to 36 of Jantzen as Jantzen describes the function of the multiplexers as devices "suitable for the bidirectional transfer of data ... between a serial bus interface 43 thru 46 and one of the parallel lines 11 thru 1n." This is a well known function for a device that is described as a multiplexer. Nowhere does Jantzen describe any other function for multiplexers 33 to 36.

Therefore for the reasons given above applicant submits that claims 5, 9 and 12 are not anticipated by Jantzen or even made obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art by Jantzen and hereby requests reconsideration of this rejection.

The Examiner rejects claim 2 which depends on claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Jantzen as applied to claim 12 and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,597 which is cited for teaching that an input stage has a means for filtering. The Examiner rejects claim 3 which depends on claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Jantzen as applied to claim 12 and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,294 which is cited for teaching a splitter within an input stage. The Examiner rejects claim 4 which depends on claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Jantzen and the '294 patent as applied to claim 3 and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,488,638 which is cited for teaching a means to perform parallel/serial conversion. The Examiner rejects claims 6-8 which each depend directly or indirectly on claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Jantzen as applied to claim 12 and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,319 which is cited for teaching that which is called for in claims 6-8. Applicant submits for the reasons given with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12 that the rejection of claims 2-4 and 6-8 which each depend on claim 12 no longer pertains and requests reconsideration of these rejections.

The Examiner rejects claims 13-14 under U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Jantzen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,456,406.

09/446,320

As is described above independent claim 13 also calls for the redundancy means of the present invention to comprise "an input stage at least for each of said bus lines, an evaluation stage and an output stage for all the bus lines." Thus as is taught and claimed by applicant in independent claim 13 the evaluation stage is part of the redundancy means and therefore the applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of independent claim 13 and claim 14 dependent thereon.

Reconsideration of this applicant in accordance with Rules 111 and 112 is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

8/10/04



Michael M. Rickin  
Reg. No. 26,984  
Attorney for Applicant  
ABB Inc.  
29801 Euclid Avenue  
Wickliffe, OH 44092-2530  
(440) 585-7840

I hereby certify that this Non-Fee Amendment Under Rule 111 Transmitted By Facsimile of 7 total pages but excluding a cover sheet to the Examiner's Action dated May 10, 2004 is being transmitted by facsimile to Examiner Abelson of Group Art Unit 2666 of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703)872-9306 on August 10, 2004.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Michael M. Rickin

Signature:

